

WASHINGTON
**HIGHER
EDUCATION**
COORDINATING BOARD



**WE HELP
STUDENTS
SUCCEED**



A Revised Accountability Framework

**March 30, 2006
HECB Board Meeting**



Statutory Context

- **HECB “shall establish an accountability monitoring and reporting system”**
- **HECB “shall approve biennial performance targets for each four-year institution and the community and technical college system, and shall review actual achievements annually”
(28B.76.270 RCW)**



Policy Context

2004 Strategic Master Plan

- **2 Goals**
 - o Increase opportunities for students to earn degrees
 - o Respond to the state's economic needs
- **11 Strategic initiatives**
 - o Initiative #10: Promoting student success through greater accountability



Beginnings of Implementation

- **HECB adopted accountability framework April 5, 2005**
- **2005-07 budget (with accountability provisions) adopted May 2005**



Concerns

- Multi-agency oversight
- Differing emphasis among indicators (HECB vs. budget)
- Differing timeframes (biennial vs. 6-year targets)
- Range of indicators blurs focus
- Lack of clarity of state expectations
- Lack of alignment (proposed targets and strategic master plan goals)
- Frequent accountability policy changes
- Consequences of meeting, not meeting targets



Steps in Revision Process

- **Extraordinary HECB Education Committee meeting (January 17)**
- **Work group meetings (OFM, UW, WSU, COP, and SBCTC)**
- **Legislative staff briefings**
- **HECB Education Committee meeting (March 16)**



Proposed Framework: Measures

- **Indicators with targets**
- **Indicators without targets**
- **Indicators needing further development**
 - o Job placement/employer satisfaction
 - o Comprehensive graduation rates
 - o Successful transfer



Proposed Framework: Timeframes

- **Two-year sector: biennial cycle**
- **Four-year sector**
 - o Six-year targets
 - o Two-year and four-year checkpoints toward targets
 - o New set of targets added every four years



Reporting Results

- HECB will *review* results annually
- HECB will *report* results biennially
- Two- and four-year checkpoints will NOT be used for public reporting/evaluation
- Alternatives for providing meaningful context will be explored



Performance Measures with Targets: Two-year Sector

- Associate degrees
- Ready for transfer*
- Ready for work*
- Gaining Basic Skills*

* Defined by the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges



Performance Measures with Targets: Four-year Sector

- Bachelor's degrees
- High-demand bachelor's degrees
- Advanced degrees
- Graduation rates (6-year, 3-year)
- Freshman retention
- Undergraduate efficiency (125% credits)



Performance Measures without Targets: Four-year Sector

- **Results for Pell grant recipients on all measures with targets**
- **Alumni survey results/job placement**
- **Institution-specific indicators**
- **Comprehensive undergraduate graduation rate**



Target Level Ambition

- **Institution, indicator specific**
- **Subject to negotiation**
- **General parameters of expectations provided**
 - o Connection of funding, output acknowledged (revenue up 2%)
 - o Potential improvement through operations, management acknowledged
 - o Stretch targets: degrees
 - o Improvement targets: graduation
 - o Maintenance targets: retention, efficiency



Future Steps in Process

- **HECB public meeting and presentation (March 30)**
- **Additional institutional, public input**
- **HECB analysis and evaluation of proposed targets**
- **OFM approval**
- **Final adoption by HECB (May 25)**



Additional Future Work

- Explore means of measuring quality
- Consider annual institute of best practices
- Investigate potential for incentives attached to targets

WASHINGTON
**HIGHER
EDUCATION**
COORDINATING BOARD



**WE HELP
STUDENTS
SUCCEED**